



04-05-06

IFW  
/\$

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Gregory Alan Beckman et al**  
Serial No.: **10/618,550**  
Filed: **07/11/2003**  
For: **Modular Aquaculture Filtration System**

Group No.: **1723**  
Examiner: **Joseph W. Drodge**

**Mail Stop Amendment**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Dear Sir:

In response to the office action of October 3, 2005, applicant submits the following:

**Extension Request**

A three-month extension of time within which to respond to the office action of October 3, 2005 in the above-referenced matter is hereby requested. A check in the amount of \$510.00 is included with this request to cover the extension fee.

**Office Action Response**

**Election:** Claims 1 – 38 are pending in the application. Claims 33 – 38 are subject to a provisional election requirement. Applicant hereby confirms that Claims 1 – 32 are elected for prosecution in this application (Group I), with the understanding that if claim 23 is allowed, then any claim depending from or otherwise including all of the limitations of claim 23 as allowed will be entitled to examination in this application.

**Drawings:** Your applicant has attached a full set of replacement drawings. Applicant earlier submitted only replacement drawings for Figures 1, 2, and 11, but did not include additional copies of the other figures. The October 10, 2003 Notice to File Missing Parts only identified Figures 1, 2, and 11 as objectionable. Applicant is uncertain if the examiner's present

objection to the drawings goes beyond the observation that copies of all drawings were not included with the prior replacement sheets. Applicant will have formal drawings prepared if the examiner considers the full set of the present drawings inadequate for purposes of continued examination of the application.

**Indefiniteness 35 USC 112:** The examiner asserts that claims 3 – 7, 9 and 27 – 32 are indefinite for failing to provide nexus and relationship to other components for the limitations “means for joining” and “means for sealing a joint.” Your applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 24, 25 and 27 to provide nexus and relationship to other components. Claims 4 – 7, 9 and 28 – 32 depend upon these amended claims. Your applicant believes that these amendments resolve the examiner’s complaint regarding indefiniteness.

**Amendments:**

Please amend claims 1, 3, 24, 25, and 27, as shown in the claims recitation below: